



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 1998

No. 104

House of Representatives

REPORT REGARDING ONGOING EFFORTS TO MEET GOALS TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION OF DAYTON ACCORDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-292)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 105-174, I am providing this report to inform the Congress of ongoing efforts to meet the goals set forth therein.

With my certification to the Congress of March 3, 1998, I outlined ten conditions—or benchmarks—under which Dayton implementation can continue without the support of a major NATO-led military force. Section 7 of Public Law 105-174 urges that we seek concurrence among NATO allies on: (1) the benchmarks set forth with the March 3 certification; (2) estimated target dates for achieving those benchmarks; and (3) a process for NATO to review progress toward achieving those benchmarks. NATO has agreed to move ahead in all these areas.

First, NATO agreed to benchmarks parallel to ours on May 28 as part of its approval of the Stabilization Force (SFOR) military plan (OPLAN 10407). Furthermore, the OPLAN requires SFOR to develop detailed criteria for each of these benchmarks, to be approved by the North Atlantic Council, which will provide a more specific basis to evaluate progress. SFOR will develop the benchmark criteria in coordination with appropriate international civilian agencies.

Second, with regard to timelines, the United States proposed that NATO military authorities provide an estimate of the time likely to be required

for implementation of the military and civilian aspects of the Dayton Agreement based on the benchmark criteria. Allies agreed to this approach on June 10. As SACEUR General Wes Clark testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee June 4, the development and approval of the criteria and estimated target dates should take 2 to 3 months.

Third, with regard to a review process, NATO will continue the 6-month review process that began with the deployment of the Implementation Force (IFOR) in December 1995, incorporating the benchmarks and detailed criteria. The reviews will include an assessment of the security situation, an assessment of compliance by the parties with the Dayton Agreement, an assessment of progress against the benchmark criteria being developed by SFOR, recommendations on any changes in the level of support to civilian agencies, and recommendations on any other changes to the mission and tasks of the force.

While not required under Public Law 105-174, we have sought to further utilize this framework of benchmarks and criteria for Dayton implementation among civilian implementation agencies. The Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC) adopted the same framework in its Luxembourg declaration of June 9, 1998. The declaration, which serves as the civilian implementation agenda for the next 6 months, now includes language that corresponds to the benchmarks in the March 3 certification to the Congress and in the SFOR OPLAN. In addition, the PIC Steering Board called on the High Representative to submit a report on the progress made in meeting these goals by mid-September, which will be considered in the NATO 6-month review process.

The benchmark framework, now approved by military and civilian implementers, is clearly a better approach

than setting a fixed, arbitrary end date to the mission. This process will produce a clear picture of where intensive efforts will be required to achieve our goal: a self-sustaining peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina for which a major international military force will no longer be necessary. Experience demonstrates that arbitrary deadlines can prove impossible to meet and tend to encourage those who would wait us out or undermine our credibility. Realistic target dates, combined with concerted use of incentives, leverage and pressure with all the parties, should maintain the sense of urgency necessary to move steadily toward an enduring peace. While the benchmark process will be useful as a tool both to promote and review the pace of Dayton implementation, the estimated target dates established will be notional, and their attainment dependent upon a complex set of interdependent factors.

We will provide a supplemental report once NATO has agreed upon detailed criteria and estimated target dates. The continuing 6-month reviews of the status of implementation will provide a useful opportunity to continue to consult with Congress. These reviews, and any updates to the estimated timelines for implementation, will be provided in subsequent reports submitted pursuant to Public Law 105-174. I look forward to continuing to work with the Congress in pursuing U.S. foreign policy goals in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 28, 1998.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FISCAL YEAR 1999 BUDGET REQUEST ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-294)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6705

States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 202(c) of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 1999 Budget Request Act.

This proposed Fiscal Year 1999 Budget represents the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor, the Council of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. It also meets the financial stability and management improvement objectives of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997. For Fiscal Year 1999, the District estimates revenues of \$5.230 billion and total expenditures of \$5.189 billion resulting in a \$41 million budget surplus.

My transmittal of the District of Columbia's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 28, 1998.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4328, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 510 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4328.

□ 2303

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4328) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will not read the whole statement, but just about two paragraphs to make a couple of points. This is the first transportation appropriations bill since the enactment of the Transportation Equity Act, TEA21, which has made significant effects on the way the committee operates.

For example, TEA21 amended the Budget Enforcement Act to provide two additional spending categories or "firewalls," the highway category and the transit category. These firewalls make it virtually impossible for the committee to make drawdown adjustments to those funding levels in the appropriation process over the next 5 years.

As such, these firewalls create a new mandatory appropriations within the discretionary caps which has undermined the committee's flexibility to fund other equally important programs.

The bill reflects the first attempt to produce a balanced bill in this new environment. The committee was allocated a 7.4 percent increase, or \$2.8 billion in outlays for the coming year. However, the increases for the highway and transit programs guaranteed by TEA21 fully consumed the 7.4 percent increase provided to the subcommittee. As a result, the other agencies must compete for the leftover funding, which is essentially at a hard freeze.

Within these constraints, the bill continues to place the highest priority on safety programs and drug interdiction of the Coast Guard. But, as a result of the lack of flexibility available to the committee, and after meeting the highway and transit guarantees, sufficient funding is not available for many critical and important programs of the Coast Guard, FAA, and even NHTSA. While the highway and transit programs are feasting at a banquet, these other agencies are left to scramble for the crumbs.

One other point I want to make, I have told the Commandant of the Coast Guard that should the committee receive any additional allocation, perhaps Defense allocation later on, that we will make every effort to supplement the current funding provided in the bill.

Today the Committee on Appropriations brings to the floor the ninth appropriations bill for fiscal year 1999. H.R. 4328, the fiscal year 1999 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, totals \$46.9 billion. This figure includes all obligation authority (that is to say, new budget authority, guaranteed obligations contained in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, limitations on obligations, and exempt obligations). This is an increase of \$4.7 billion over the fiscal year 1998 level and \$3.9 billion more than the budget request.

This is the first transportation appropriations bill since the enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21). TEA21 has had significant effects on the way in which this Committee operates and it has diminished the flexibility available to the Committee. For example, TEA21 amended the Budget Enforcement Act to provide two new additional spending categories or "firewalls"—the highway category and the transit category. These firewalls make it virtually impossible for the Appropriations Committee to make downward adjustments to these funding levels in the appropriations process over the next five years. As such, these firewalls created new mandatory appropriations within the discretionary caps. This has undermined the Committee's flexibility to fund other equally important programs.

This bill reflects the best attempt to produce a balanced bill in this new environment. The subcommittee was allocated a 7.4 percent increase or \$2.8 billion in outlays for the coming year. However, the increases for highways and transit programs guaranteed TEA21 fully consume the 7.4 percent increase provided to the Subcommittee. As a result, the other agencies must compete for leftover funding, which is essentially at a hard freeze. Within these constraints, the bill continues to place the highest priority on the department's safety programs and drug interdiction activities of the Coast Guard. But, as a result of lack of flexibility available to this Committee and after meeting the highway and transit guarantees, sufficient funding is not available for many critical and important programs of the Coast Guard, the FAA, and even NHTSA. While the highway and transit programs are feasting at a banquet, these agencies are left to scramble for the crumbs.

Were it not for the firewalls, a portion of the generous 7.4 percent increase or \$2.8 billion could have been allocated to improvements in aviation or maritime safety, and more could have done to fight the menace of illegal drug trafficking, while still providing significant increases in highways and transit programs. The bill shies away from funding new authorizations contained in TEA21. The bill also does not contain funding above the guaranteed amounts for the highway and transit programs, as other critical programs, including safety and drug interdiction activities, would have had to have been cut in order to fund the new authorizations and any increases above the guarantee.

Selected major recommendations of the bill include the following:

- (1) \$7.7 billion for the FAA, an increase of \$275 over the 1998 level;
- (2) \$1.8 for the AIP program, an increase of \$100 million;
- (3) \$2.7 billion for the Coast Guard's operating expenses, including \$446 million for drug interdiction activities (an increase of 11 percent);
- (4) \$609 million for Amtrak, essentially the same level as the Administration's request;
- (5) \$461 million for NHTSA, the fully authorized level, including \$100 million for motor carrier safety grants that are transferred from FHWA;
- (6) \$25.5 billion for federal-aid highways, as is guaranteed by TEA21; and
- (7) \$5.4 billion for transit programs, the same level as guaranteed by TEA21.

Returning to the Coast Guard, the bill provides \$2.7 billion, essentially a hard freeze.